

**EXHIBIT 61**  
**REDACTED**

**MAO DECLARATION**  
**OPPOSITION TO SUMMARY**  
**JUDGMENT**

## Message

**From:** Phiroze Parakh [REDACTED]@google.com]  
**Sent:** 11/19/2018 4:53:01 PM  
**To:** Luke Swartz [REDACTED]@google.com]  
**CC:** Frank Worsley [REDACTED]@google.com]; JK Kearns [REDACTED]@google.com]; Ela Beres [REDACTED]@google.com]; David Monsees [REDACTED]@google.com]  
**Subject:** Re: WAA check for user models

ping :)

On Wed, Nov 14, 2018 at 10:54 AM Phiroze Parakh <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
+1 to the consistency argument here. Getting alignment across PAs will be challenging.  
@Frank Worsley Are you saying YT history (PA 1) is used by Play Movies (PA2) ie: a Cross PA user model?

On Wed, Nov 14, 2018 at 10:17 AM Luke Swartz <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
+1 for setting a Google-wide policy rather than one that only applies to Search (since ULP is used by various PAs)...we'd be happy to filter on our side but it's harder if the policies aren't aligned.

On Wed, Nov 14, 2018 at 10:12 AM Frank Worsley <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
At the moment Anima does not work this way. Here is how we handle the WAA bit.

It's more complicated for us since our models are used across Google. For example if WAA is off, but YouTube history is on, then we would still have a good media user model that could be used by Play Movies to personalize their product experience.

We could make the change that Ela suggests, but you need to take a Google-wide view beyond Search. It would make sense if the Google-wide policy is going to be that if WAA=off then no personalization anywhere. But is that the current policy?

On Tue, Nov 13, 2018 at 11:17 PM JK Kearns <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
SGTM, although I don't understand the downsides to this proposal.

On Tue, Nov 13, 2018 at 11:10 PM Ela Beres <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
Yes - that's definitely the user story. The question is how to enforce it.

I'm suggesting that user-facing feature teams should check WAA but that the user model teams \*also\* check WAA as extra added security - that way if a feature team misses the check, they won't have any data passed from the user model anyway.

On Tue, Nov 13, 2018, 10:50 PM JK Kearns <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
I think teams should not use user data at all if WAA is off, regardless if there is user data that was collected when WAA was on. It's a much cleaner story and what I would think most users expect.

On Tue, Nov 13, 2018 at 4:31 PM Ela Beres <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
Hey guys

Now that we have collected agreed that any Personalization based on clicks or search history should check WAA, I wanted to re-visit the question of where we enforce the WAA check in the case of user models.

My original thought was that this could be enforced by features teams, both the teams providing data to the model and the teams that use the data.

The problem with the first is that turning off WAA does not delete search history - it just pauses its collection, and user models can still make inferences on existing data. The teams that use the data should check WAA, but this is error prone (there are several teams that use ULP today that don't check WAA).

The alternative is that the user modeling teams themselves check WAA and don't provide inferences at all unless WAA is on.

What do you guys think? Frank / Luke - I added you here as spokesman for Anima and ULP, and feel free to add others.

Thanks!

--  
Luke Swartz  
Product Manager  
[\[REDACTED\]@google.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@google.com)